

## REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are pending. Claims 1-16 are rejected. Claims 1-2, 5-7, and 12 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

### 35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejections

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Hasebe et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,392,351, in view of Best, U.S. Patent No. 4,465,901.

The Examiner is respectfully directed to independent Claim 1, which, as amended, recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to:

A method for improving the security of software, comprising the steps of:  
    reading encrypted software from a non-volatile storage medium;  
    storing said encrypted software in a temporary storage medium;  
and,  
    contemporaneously decrypting a portion of said encrypted  
software as said portion is read into an instruction cache in a processor.

Claims 7 and 12 recite similar limitations. Claims 2-6 are dependent upon Claim 1, and recite additional features of the claimed invention. Claims 8-11 are dependent upon Claim 7, and recite additional features of the claimed invention. Claims 13-16 are dependent upon Claim 12, and recite additional features of the claimed invention.

The rejection suggests that Hasebe et al. discloses reading encrypted software from a non-volatile storage medium, and decrypting those portions of encrypted software that are read into an instruction cache in a processor as each of said portions is read into the instruction cache. Applicant has reviewed the cited portions of Hasebe et al., and

respectfully disagrees. Applicant understands Hasebe et al. to disclose an electronic data protection system, col. 1, ln. 31-32, in which encrypted electronic data is read from a storage medium, e.g. fig. 10A, decrypted, col. 9 ln. 10-13, and loads the corresponding *decrypted* program from the storage medium into temporary storage (RAM), col. 9, ln. 13-19. As such, the device disclosed in Hasebe does not decrypt portions of encrypted data at the time those portions are loaded into the instruction cache, as claimed. Applicant therefore asserts that Hasebe et al. does not disclose contemporaneously decrypting a portion of said encrypted software as said portion is read into an instruction cache in a processor, as claimed.

The rejection also states that Hasebe et al. does not disclose storing encrypted software in a temporary storage medium. Applicant respectfully agrees.

Therefore, Hasebe et al. alone does not anticipate or render obvious the embodiments of the present invention disclosed in Claim 1 (Claims 7 and 12 have similar limitations).

The rejections suggests combining Hasebe et al. with Best. The Applicant respectfully contends that the cited combination does not render obvious the embodiments of the present invention disclosed in Claim 1 (Claims 7 and 12 have similar limitations), because Best does not overcome the deficiencies of Hasebe et al. Applicant understands Best to disclose a cryptographic microprocessor, col. 3, ln. 35-40. The device disclosed receives enciphered data into its block registers before any operations

are carried out. Applicant therefore asserts that Best does not disclose contemporaneously decrypting a portion of said encrypted software as said portion is read into an instruction cache in a processor, as claimed. Consequently, Hasebe et al., alone or in conjunction with Best, does not anticipate or render obvious the embodiment of the present invention disclosed in Claim 1 (Claims 7 and 12 have similar limitations).

Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed embodiments of the invention as set forth in Claims 1, 7, and 12 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Applicants also respectfully submit that Claims 2-6, 8-11, and 13-16 dependent on Claims 1, 7, and 12 respectively, overcome the basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as they are dependent on allowable base claims.

Conclusion

In light of the above-listed amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the remaining Claims.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Date: 6/13, 2005



Anthony C. Murabito  
Reg. No. 35,295  
Two North Market Street  
Third Floor  
San Jose, California 95113  
(408) 938-9060